

Application No. 10/840,107
Response dated: September 19, 2006
Reply to Final Office action dated: July 19, 2006

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action dated July 19, 2006, Applicants respectfully requests reconsideration based on the above claim amendments and the following remarks. Applicants respectfully submit that the claims as presented are in condition for allowance.

Claims 1-5, 8, 9, 16-21 and 38 are pending in the present Application. Claims 1 and 38 have been amended and Claim 2 has been cancelled without prejudice, leaving Claims 1, 3-5, 8, 9, 16-21 and 38 for consideration upon entry of the present amendments and following remarks.

Support for the amendments to the claims is at least found in the specification, the figures, and the claims as originally filed. More particularly, support for amended Claims 1 and 38 is at least found in Figures 3, 4 and 13, cancelled Claim 2 and in the specification at page 12, lines 11-13 and page 29, lines 12-14. Claims 3 and 9 are amended to provide proper dependency based on the cancellation of Claim 2.

No new matter has been introduced by these amendments. Reconsideration and allowance of the claims are respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-5, 8, 9, 16-21 and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Ozawa et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,956,632 (hereinafter "Ozawa"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections. Claim 2 is hereinabove cancelled without prejudice and rejections are rendered moot for these claims. *(Applicants respectfully note that Claim 35 is indicated as being rejected over Ozawa. However, Claim 35 is Withdrawn. Therefore, Applicants understand the indicated Claim 35 to be Claim 38 rejected over Ozawa.)*

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. V. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987).

Amended Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*,

"an organic insulation layer disposed over the transparent substrate, the organic insulation layer being thinner gradually at a boundary between the transmissive window and the reflective window;

a reflective layer disposed over the organic insulation layer of the reflective window;

Application No. 10/840,107
Response dated: September 19, 2006
Reply to Final Office action dated: July 19, 2006

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

a first boundary between the reflective window and the transmissive window disposed in that sequence along the rubbing direction;
a second boundary between the transmissive window and the reflective window disposed in that sequence along the rubbing direction; and
a light blocking pattern disposed at only the first boundary to prevent a light leakage."

Firstly, regarding Claims 1 and 38, Applicants note that the Response to Arguments section of the present Office action does not provide explanation in response to Applicants arguments filed April 20, 2006 as to how Ozawa discloses "a reflective layer disposed over the organic insulation layer of the reflective window" when clearly the reflective layer 4 is disposed under the layer thickness adjusting region 6 as shown in Figure 1-5.

The Examiner indicates that Ozawa discloses "an organic insulation layer disposed over the transparent substrate, the organic insulation layer being thinner gradually at a boundary between the transmissive window and the reflective window," of Claim 1, but does not specify which element is being considered this feature of the claimed invention. For purposes of this Office Action, Applicants consider the layer-thickness adjusting film 6 as shown in Figs. 1-6 as teaching the "organic insulation layer."

The Examiner further indicates that Ozawa discloses "a reflective layer disposed over the organic insulation layer of the reflective window," but does not specify which element is being considered this feature of the claimed invention. For purposes of this Office Action, Applicants consider the reflecting layer 4 as shown in Figs. 1-5 as teaching the "organic insulation layer."

In each of the Figs. 1-5 of Ozawa, the reflecting layer 4 is shown to be disposed under the layer-thickness adjusting film 6 (considered as the organic insulation layer), under the color filter 81 and disposed on the layer between the color filter 81/transmissive display color filter 82 and the polarizer 41. That is, the reflecting layer 4 is not disposed over the layer thickness adjusting region 6 (considered as the "organic insulation layer") as claimed. Therefore, Ozawa does not disclose "a reflective layer disposed over the organic insulation layer of the reflective window" of amended Claims 1 and 38.

Secondly, Applicants respectfully submit that Ozawa does not disclose a light blocking pattern disposed at only the first boundary to prevent a light leakage of amended Claims 1 and 38.

Ozawa discloses light shielding film 9 disposed along an entire inner peripheral edge of the light reflecting layer 4 and covering an edge portion of the light reflecting layer 4. (Col. 9,

Application No. 10/840,107
Response dated: September 19, 2006
Reply to Final Office action dated: July 19, 2006

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

lines 60-67 and Figures 1-5.) Regarding Figure 6 of Ozawa discloses layer-thickness adjusting layers 6 (which may be considered as the "organic insulation layer" of the claimed invention) having upwardly inclined surface 60 at the boundary of the reflective display region 31 and transmissive display region 32. (Col. 18, lines 63-66 and Figure 6.) Light shielding films 9 are formed over the entire boundary region of the reflective display region 31 and transmissive display region 32. (Col. 19, lines 1-11 and Figure 6.)

As clearly disclosed by Ozawa, light shielding film 9 is specifically disposed around *entire* boundary edges/regions in Figures 1-6. That is, light shielding film 9 is not disclosed at *only* the first boundary as claimed. Therefore, Ozawa does not disclose a first boundary between the reflective window and the transmissive window disposed in that sequence along the rubbing direction, a second boundary between the transmissive window and the reflective window disposed in that sequence along the rubbing direction and a light blocking pattern disposed at only the first boundary to prevent a light leakage of amended Claims 1 and 38.

Finally, regarding Claims 8 and 16, the Examiner states in both the rejection details on Pages 2 to 3 and in the Response to Arguments section at Page 4, that Ozawa discloses "the second boundary is inclined steeper than the first boundary" in at least Figures 1b and 1c. Applicant again respectfully disagrees.

Ozawa merely discloses that the layer thickness adjusting layer 6 constitutes an upward inclines surface 60 in the boundary region of the reflective display region 31 and the transmissive display region. (Col. 9, lines 31-35 with respect to Figures 1C-1C, Col. 12, lines 11-14 with respect to Figures 2A-2C, Col. 13, line 66 to Col. 14, line 2 with respect to Figure 3A-3C, Col. 15, lines 56-59 with respect to Figures 4A-4B, Col. 17, lines 41-44 with respect to Figure 5 and Col. 18, lines 63-66 with respect to Figure 6.) Figures 1-6 illustrate the inclined surfaces 60 at substantially the same incline.

Applicants find no disclosure in Ozawa of the inclined surface 60 being steeper one boundary compared to the other boundary. Therefore, Ozawa also does not disclose "the second boundary is inclined steeper than the first boundary" of Claims 8 and 16. Applicants again respectfully request the Examiner to provide further explanation as to how Ozawa discloses the limitations of Claims 8 and 16.

Thus, Ozawa fails to teach all of the limitations of at least Claims 1 and 38 (as amended), 8 and 16. Accordingly, Ozawa does not anticipate Claims 1 and 38 (as amended), 8 and 16.

Application No. 10/840,107
Response dated: September 19, 2006
Reply to Final Office action dated: July 19, 2006

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1, 8, 16 and 38 are not further rejected or objected and are therefore allowable. Claims 3-5, 9 and 17-21 variously depend from Claim 1 and are correspondingly allowable as depending upon Claim 1. Reconsideration and allowance of Claims 1, 3-5, 8, 9, 16-21 and 38 are respectfully requested.

Conclusion

All of the objections and rejections are herein overcome. In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the instant application is in condition for allowance. No new matter is added by way of the present Amendments and Remarks, as support is found throughout the original filed specification, claims and drawings. Prompt issuance of Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' attorney at the below listed phone number regarding this response or otherwise concerning the present application.

Applicants hereby petition for any necessary extension of time required under 37 C.F.R. 1.136(a) or 1.136(b) which may be required for entry and consideration of the present Reply.

If there are any charges due with respect to this Amendment or otherwise, please charge them to Deposit Account No. 06-1130 maintained by Applicants' attorneys.

Respectfully submitted,

CANTOR COLBURN LLP

By: Amy Bizon Copp
Amy Bizon Copp
Reg. No. 53,993
CANTOR COLBURN LLP
55 Griffin Road South
Bloomfield, CT 06002
Telephone (860) 286-2929
Facsimile (860) 286-0115

Date: September 19, 2006

BEST AVAILABLE COPY